2001

2ND ANNUAL INSPECTION REPORT ON MARINE FINFISH AQUACULTURE SITES

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FISHERIES

FEBRUARY, 2002

Prepared by:

Aquaculture Licensing and Compliance Branch
Resource Development and Sustainability Division

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Mandate	
A. Licensing, Compliance and Enforcement Overview	3
B. Legislative and Regulatory Framework	6
Background of Industry	8
Methodology	9
2001 Compliance Table – Number of Sites in Compliance	10
Compliance Rates – Regulatory and Licensing Requirements	
A. Management Plans	13
B. Therapeutant Use and Drug Record Keeping	15
C. Stock Inventory Reports and Record Keeping	16
D. Net Maintenance, Marking and Record Keeping	17
E. Frequency of Net Inspections	20
F. Escape Prevention	21
G. Escape Response	22
H. Farm Site Operations	22
Other Compliance and Enforcement Activities for 2001	
A. Joint Inspection Activity	28
B. Pre-inspections for relocations/new licence applications	29
C. Dive Audit Program	30
D. Branch Investigations	33
Summary	35

LIST OF CHARTS AND GRAPHS

		Page
1	Piece Count	8
2	Compliance Rate Per Company	10
3	2001 Compliance Summary Table	11-12
4	Compliance to Licensing Terms and Conditions	14
5	Stock Inventory Records / Training Compliance	16
6	Net Marking / Maintenance Compliance	19
7	Frequency of Net Inspections	21
8	Morts Inspected	23
9	Farm Site Observations	26
10	Predator Control	27

LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS

		Page
1.	Photograph of net properly bagged and protected from ultraviolet rays	18
2.	Photograph of an escape recovery kit	22
3.	Photograph of an anchor used as an external weight	24
4.	Photograph of a farm site docking area	25
5.	Photograph of a sealed feed container	26
6.	Photograph of bird netting used as predator control device	27
7.	Photographs from dive audit – weights, nets and containment structures	32

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix I	Company List and Number of Farms/Companies Inspected in 2001
Appendix 2	2001 Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries Fish Farm Site Inspection Checklist
Appendix 3	Summary Inspection Letter to Industry Headquarters
Appendix 4	Legislation - Fisheries Act (BC) - Aquaculture Regulation (amended October 31, 2000)
Appendix 5	Summary Information on Primary Causes of Escapes
Appendix 6	General Factors Considered in Licensing Decisions
Appendix 7	Escape Incident Reporting Form

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (MAFF) is the lead agency for aquaculture development in British Columbia. Authorities and key functions also reside within other provincial agencies that have an interest in regulation of the industry. These agencies include the Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection (MWLAP), the Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management (MSRM), BC Assets and Land Corporation and Fisheries and Oceans Canada (FOC).

The *BC Fisheries Act* and *Aquaculture Regulation* are administered by MAFF who have the responsibility to regulate the following aquaculture activities:

- escape prevention and escape response;
- farm record keeping requirements;
- net maintenance activities;
- general farm site operations; and,
- compliance with licence terms and conditions including approved site management plans.

Prior to October 31, 2000, regulatory requirements on the issue of escapes and those concerning farm practices were fairly general and only required that a licence holder take reasonable precautions to prevent the escape of fish and that the holder report an escape. In the absence of more detailed regulatory requirements, MAFF Inspectors had to review on-site activities and determine if these activities were consistent with industry standards in order to assess the state of compliance.

Last year's inspection report concluded general satisfaction with the state of compliance and did cite upgrades around the infrastructure of containment systems, development of policies and procedures on escape prevention and recovery, and standards for equipment design and net quality. The report noted, however, that the amended regulation would provide MAFF Inspectors with some objective and enforceable standards for future inspections.

With the introduction of new and more stringent regulations that came into effect on October 31, 2000 (*Appendix 4B*), MAFF Inspectors were provided with specific standards and guidelines that could be used to effectively measure the state of industry compliance. For the year 2001, compliance inspections were conducted at all active salmon farms in the province. This year's cycle of inspections were the first where companies were measured against the newly amended regulation.

What MAFF Inspectors encountered in the 2001 inspection cycle was an overall state of improvement in compliance compared to the 2000 inspection cycle, but recognition that the industry is in transition. The majority of provincial fish farming operators have made adjustments to bring themselves into compliance with the new regulatory requirements, and continual upgrades were noted by MAFF Inspectors for 2001 in the areas of containment system infrastructure, escape procedures, and net quality and equipment design.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The most prominent area of concern identified during the 2001 inspection cycle was the inconsistency between approved site specific management plans and actual on-site operations. Specific concern has been raised with industry over production levels at some sites and it is expected adjustments will occur at these sites, either through correction of production levels to appropriate levels, or through approval requests for appropriate levels.

Another common area of non-compliance was the absence of written net maintenance records on site. 48 percent of farms were identified as non-compliant with net maintenance, marking and record keeping requirements. In most cases, however, the non-compliance issue related to written records for nets not being maintained as required and other elements had high levels of compliance.

In general, industry response to this year's assessment of compliance and necessary follow up has been favourable. In most cases where non-compliance has been identified, companies have been cooperative and quick to respond.

It is expected that overall compliance rates for companies will improve during the upcoming cycle of inspections for 2002. Government has recently been examining the *Aquaculture Regulation* in the context of providing a more streamlined and performance-based regulation that does not jeopardize important environmental values, particularly in the areas of waste management, fish health and escape prevention. It is expected the changes will come into effect on or before April 30, 2002, and will enable MAFF Inspection staff to assess compliance against these new environmental standards.

MANDATE

A. OVERVIEW OF AQUACULTURE LICENSING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM

The Aquaculture Licensing and Compliance program's mandate recognizes the need for transparency and accountability relative to MAFF's licensing and compliance functions in the province. This mandate is met by the application of an integrated licensing and compliance program that applies unfettered personal and institutional independence decision-making principles to meet identified environmental standards.

A key function of the Aquaculture Licensing and Compliance Branch is the responsibility to receive, adjudicate and issue commercial seafood licences and permits for the following industries:

- finfish aquaculture operations and hatcheries, including freshwater operations;
- commercial seafood activities, including fish buying stations, fish and marine plant processing and cold storage facilities; fish vendors; and fish brokers;
- commercial harvests of marine plants, wild oysters and non-tidal commercial fisheries.

The Aquaculture Licensing and Compliance Branch also has the responsibility to:

- monitor, inspect, enforce and report on commercial fisheries and finfish and shellfish aquaculture industries.

Licensing:

The provincial government, as part of the salmon aquaculture policy framework, recently identified 11 salmon farms for relocation as a result of social, environmental, or economic concerns. The provincial government announced in 2001 a second round of sites, 25 in total, that will be relocated based on the same identified values.

Relocation of some existing salmon aquaculture operations are expected to mitigate impacts to environmental values and ensure compliance with regulatory environmental standards. As part of this initiative, government is developing a guide for completing Site Applications that will outline more stringent siting, monitoring and reporting requirements. It is expected that the Site Application guide will be released this year.

MANDATE

With respect to the review of new salmon farm licence applications, including relocations, the licensing procedure is both thorough and complex. Considerable review is completed to determine if the proponent's application meets identified policy criteria. General principles guiding the deliberations on salmon farm applications include: fairness; transparency; efficiency; and accountability.

The key values that are applied and considered by licensing officials include:

- protection of public health and safety;
- protection of the environment; and
- sustainable economic development.

The licensing policy, attached as *Appendix* 6 to this report, provides the guideline applied by the licensing authority in considering licence applications.

Inherent in the licensing decision review process is consideration of the past or demonstrable performance of the applicant which includes a review of compliance history. This includes consideration of the following factors:

- whether the applicant has had any previous convictions under relevant provincial legislation;

- whether the applicant has been the subject of any licence suspensions, cancellations or refusals to licence pursuant to the *Fisheries Act* (BC);

- whether there are any outstanding fees or royalties owned to the Crown with regard to current or previously held aquaculture licences; and,

- whether the applicant has the necessary experience and qualifications in the aquaculture sector.

Information and data collected during annual inspections, the dive audit program and through previous investigations provide licensing authorities with critical information relative to the past or demonstrable performance of the applicant.

MANDATE

Compliance and Enforcement:

The compliance and enforcement regime for MAFF Inspection staff includes application or promotion of the following elements:

- awareness, education, promotion and training activities;
- promoting industry best practices, developing cooperative partnerships and agreements contributing to government objectives;
- conducting monitoring, inspections and audits;
- conducting investigations on alleged legislative and or licensing violations; and,
- public reporting on the compliance status of salmon farm inspections.

Recent enhancements to the compliance program have included:

- enhanced regular inspections of all active finfish aquaculture farms;
- recent introduction (year 2000) of the dive audit program, described in more detail later in this report;
- implementation of a licensing and enforcement case file tracking system;
- implementation of a 24 hour toll-free escape reporting line (1-877-223-4673);
- enhanced training for inspections staff; and,
- enhanced vessel fleet for improved all weather access to marine sites and improved Remote Operating Vehicle capability.

MAFF will continue to look for opportunities to implement enhancements in its compliance program in order to meet our commitment for an aquaculture industry that has high standards for environmental protection.

MANDATE

B. LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Many Acts and Regulations the industry is subject to are non-specific to aquaculture and cover a broad range of industrial activities. Some of these are currently administered by the Ministry of Water, Land Air and Protection (MWLAP) and include the *Firearms Act, Pesticide Control Act, Waste Management Act, Water Act* and *Wildlife Act*. The *(BC) Fisheries Act* and *Aquaculture Regulation* are more specific to aquaculture and are administered by MAFF.

The authority provided under the (BC) *Fisheries Act* provides MAFF the ability to license operations and regulate on-site farming activities and provides MAFF with the authority to set out licensing requirements, which include terms of licence, species and production limit approved for each operation, and any additional terms and conditions. The *Aquaculture Regulation* governs the operational aspects of the farm.

Aquaculture Regulation:

As part of the Salmon Aquaculture Review's recommendations, an amended regulation came into effect on October 31, 2000. These regulations contain detailed information that cover operational aspects of the salmon farm. They are found as Appendix 2 titled "Standards of Practice for Marine Fin Fish Aquaculture Escape Prevention and Response" and are attached to this document as *Appendix 4B*.

These new regulations include more comprehensive requirements for the salmon farm operator. They include specific requirements on frequency of net inspections, inspections of containment systems, predator control and avoidance, boat operations, net monitoring and inspection, dive inspections, anchoring systems, escape prevention and response policies, harvesting and processing requirements and more detailed and complete documentation and record keeping requirements. In general, the new regulation requires the operator to be more accountable for on-site activities.

The amended regulation was developed to reflect current trends in industry and in many cases, parallel the current best practices provided for in the Code of Practice developed by industry.

MANDATE

While recognizing the benefits of the October 31, 2000, *Aquaculture Regulation* amendment, streamlining and updating regulations are necessary in order to meet our public interest objectives. As a result of inspections and other industry assessments it is expected a more streamlined and performance-based *Aquaculture Regulation* will be in place on or before April 30, 2002, in time for the 2002 inspection cycle. More detailed discussion on the proposed regulatory changes are provided for in the summary discussion.

BACKGROUND OF INDUSTRY

Seafood processing information collected by MAFF statistics staff indicate that in the year 2000, total landings and production for farmed salmon was estimated at 49,400 tonnes. This volume equates to a landed value of $281.7 million and a wholesale value of $320 million.

The total landings and production levels for farmed finfish are from 121 licensed marine aquaculture farms. The majority of licensed tenures are located in four principal areas of the province:

- Northern Vancouver Island – 38 sites;
- East Coast of Vancouver Island – 33 sites;
- Clayoquot Sound – 26 sites;
- Sechelt coastal waters – 10 sites; and,
- the remaining sites are scattered in various locations throughout British Columbia coastal waters

Of the 121 licensed sites, for the 2001 inspection cycle, 83 were operational or "active" and the remaining sites were fallow for this inspection cycle. "Fallow" sites are defined as finfish aquaculture farms that are inactive. Keeping a site fallow is a strategy applied to allow the seabed to recover from any organic input prior to stocking the next production cycle, and is used to ensure operations are compliant with performance-based waste standards prescribed by MWLAP.

The following graph provides the breakdown for species currently being held on provincially licensed fish farms.



GRAPH 1

METHODOLOGY

INSPECTION ACTIVITIES

While inspections can occur at any time during the year, most annual inspections are completed between the months of May to October. The objective of these inspections is assess compliance with regulatory requirements and licence terms and conditions as set out in the Aquaculture Licence by attending and inspecting each operating farm site.

During the on-site inspection, Inspectors interview company officials and review the farm's operational procedures and maintenance records for completeness and compliance with the regulation. The Inspector also performs an above-water visual examination of the site, including a perimeter inspection of each containment pen and infrastructure including anchors, walkways and other associated hardware. In addition, spot dive audits are conducted at randomly selected sites where a dive team is contracted to review the underwater portion of the containment and anchoring system as described later in this report.

The primary inspection categories include:

- review of management plans;
- therapeutant use and drug record keeping;
- stock inventory records and record keeping;
- net maintenance; marking and record keeping;
- frequency of net inspections including diver inspections;
- escape prevention program and escape response program; and,
- farm site operations including net cage deployment, weighting systems, boat docking, used of catch nets, feed storage and predator control.

Appendix 2 provides a copy of the Fish Farm Inspection Checklist used by MAFF staff in 2001.

2001 COMPLIANCE TABLE – NUMBER OF SITES IN COMPLIANCE

The graph below provides a summary of average compliance percentage rate by company. The company list and number of farms inspected are provided in *Appendix I.*

The graph illustrates the overall compliance rate of all companies in relation to violations noted at each of their operating sites. These sites were measured against the regulatory requirements in the *Fisheries Act* (BC) and *Aquaculture Regulation.*



GRAPH 2

Note: *Legend A – N* represents the 14 marine finfish aquaculture companies and are set out in no particular order.

2001 COMPLIANCE TABLE – NUMBER OF SITES IN COMPLIANCE

The following table provides a detailed summary of issues examined and number of sites found in compliance. More detailed explanation on those areas examined follow in the next section of this report.

Compliance Issue Assessed On Site	Sites in Compliance (of 83 inspected)
Management Plan Compliance to Aquaculture Licence:	
• Full compliance to approved site Management Plan	33
Farm Site Records:	
• Maintenance of Stock Inventory Records	73
• Maintenance of Mortality Records	79
• Maintenance of Stock Source Identity Records	75
• Maintenance of Staff Training Records	59
• Ability to produce reports	78
Overall Net Maintenance, Marking and Record Keeping:	
• Tagging	71
• Tag Marking	74
• Net Written Maintenance Records	47
• Net Repairs Completed Immediately	80
• Regular Net Servicing	74
• Proper Storage (UV protection)	72
• Repairs other than nets	83
• Primary point of net attachment	66
• Jump net height	76
• Equipment – smooth surface	75
• Sufficient net weighting	81
• Appropriate mesh size	83
• Debris removal	83

2001 COMPLIANCE TABLE – NUMBER OF SITES IN COMPLIANCE

Compliance Issue Assessed On Site	Sites in Compliance (of 83 inspected)
Frequency of Net Inspections:	
• Above water checks (daily)	83
• Storm checks	77
• Dive checks upon fish introduction	83
• Maintenance of dive check records	75
• Regular hole checks	75
• Weekly mort collection	78
• Morts inspected	83
• Morts recorded	83
Escape Prevention:	
• Escape Prevention plans in place	83
• Escape Response plans posted	61
Farm Site Operations:	
• Designated docking site	73
• Docking site marked	61
• Docking site design	76
• Catch nets used during high risk activities	83
• Secure feed storage	83
• Walkways and systems clear of feed	83
• Use of spotters	83
• Proper large vessel moorage	83
• Predator control in place	83

The *Aquaculture Regulation* does not require that operators deploy predator controls. Information on predator control methods was gathered for statistical purposes and if necessary, to help determine patterns of predator attack.

Predator Control Methods:	
• Use of predator nets	40
• Use of shark guards	40
• Use of bird netting	64
• Use of sealed feed	53
• Other (may include electric fence, kill permits, dip nets)	31

COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

A. Management Plans

A management plan is a document that the farm operator is required to submit that specifies design and operation criteria of the fish farm. Management plan applications undergo an extensive review and once approved, form a condition of the Aquaculture Licence. Companies are required under the *Fisheries Act* (BC) to operate within the provisions approved in these plans.

Several important aspects of the plans that MAFF Inspectors reviewed for compliance this inspection cycle included the number and size of the pens that are on site and site configuration, the species being cultured, and the biomass or piece count permitted on site.

Of the 83 farms surveyed, 40 percent were in compliance with requirements of the management plans. Those out of compliance included 51 percent where site configurations were non conforming, 51 percent had in excess of the identified maximum allowable biomass and 2 percent had unapproved species on site.

The high level of non-compliance is in part due to high expectations that industry would soon be moving to an outcome-based performance model and that prescriptive indicators within the management plan would no longer be relied upon as the approved model.

Due to the uncertain time frame for the change to the outcome-based performance models, this year MAFF's approach was to enforce current levels as set out in site specific management plans. That is, all operators have been instructed to come into compliance, either by reducing production levels, or submitting necessary approvals via site management plan amendments for site configurations, biomass levels and/or species.

Companies identified as non-compliant in this area were notified of the requirement to update management plans or adjust operating practices to reflect their most recent approved management plans. It is expected that all companies will be in compliance during the 2002 inspection cycle, as the majority of farm operators have submitted updated management plans in response to this year's inspections.

COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

It should also be noted that performance based waste management standards are expected to be in effect on or before April 30, 2002 which should address the production level issue identified at this year's inspections. Nonetheless, it is a commitment of MAFF to ensure that site specific management plans reflect approved conditions as set out in the Aquaculture Licence, and the compliance and enforcement activities applied this year reflect this new approach.

The following graph indicates the levels of compliance to Licensing requirements including specific conditions of the management plan. It shows both the overall compliance rate as well as specific compliance rates to various factors including current licensing, approved species on site, piece count and net cage configuration.

Graph 4



COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

B. Therapeutant Use and Record Keeping

There are specific regulatory standards pertaining to documentation requirements when administering prescription therapeutants to farmed fish. Documentation of therapeutants is an important record keeping requirement for the salmon farmer.

Proper withdrawal times must be observed. Records are kept that identify treatment and treatment schedules. Farm operators are therefore required to keep records of all drugs administered to farmed fish.

To satisfy this requirement, the operator must be able to demonstrate that all appropriate paper work has been completed to document and track the administration of these therapeutants.

This includes a log of:

- the therapeutants;
- how they were administered;
- the treatment schedule including the date treatment commenced;
- the date of last treatment;
- the location of the aquaculture facility;
- the species of finfish; and,
- the name of the veterinarian who prescribed any therapeutants.

The holder should also be able to produce a statement with specific information that accompanies the fish to the processing plants that provides verification that the withdrawal period has been complied with.

MAFF inspection results this year indicate that ten sites had fish that were being medicated at the time of inspection. Four of these sites had fish close to marketable size, being in the final quarter of the grow out cycle. Where fish had been medicated and documentation was reviewed, all but one site were found to be in compliance.

COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

C. Stock Inventory Reports and Record Keeping

The *Aquaculture Regulation* requires that holders keep accurate and complete inventory records of stock on hand and require these records be maintained for each net cage on the system. These records must show the inventory introduced to the farm site and documentation should include date of entry, species, hatchery, size, strain and age of fish. Reconciliation for fish transferred in or out, escapes and mortality must be reconciled in these reports.

The objective of this requirement is for the farm operator to know at any given time what the stock levels are for each net cage on the farm. These records enable the operator to accurately report incidents of escapes and are also important for the statistical database that the ministry maintains.

The inspection team did not complete detailed forensic audits and reconciliation of inventories with paper documentation. Instead compliance was based on evidence presented by the farm operator that these records were being kept. Part of the regulatory requirement is for these records to be kept on-site and made available for the Inspector upon request.

The following graph shows the overall compliance to the various documentation and or reporting requirements for stock inventory that should be kept on the farm site. The graph includes stock inventory records, source of stock, weekly mortalities and the companies ability to product these records on demand.



Graph 5

COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

D. Net Maintenance, Marking and Record Keeping

The integrity of the containment net is an important factor in salmon farming. Nets must be able to withstand the rigours of the marine environment and weak nets are more susceptible to breakage and subsequent loss of fish. During the 2001 inspection cycle at the 83 operating sites, approximately 1,000 net pens were deployed and contained fish.

The amended regulation specifies that all containment nets are to be properly tagged, maintained and stored. Detailed written maintenance records are to be maintained on site for each net and these records must be kept for a period of two years after the net is retired.

Of the 83 sites inspected, 52 percent were in compliance with all net maintenance, marking and record keeping requirements. Compliance with storage, marking, repairing, and servicing and tagging requirements was high. Compliance with net record keeping, however, was low, 57 percent.

Net Marking:

To effectively document and maintain net history, the regulation requires that each net is to be marked in a unique and permanent manner. Depending on the manufacture date of the net these requirements differ. The objective remains the same, that being a net must be identifiable through a unique number. In this manner the complete history of the net can be tracked and made available in the event it is requested by a MAFF Inspector.

Record Keeping:

Net maintenance records are comprehensive and must include all work that has been completed on the net. This includes regular out-of-water servicing and any on-site repairs once the net has been deployed. Regulations require that specific information is collected and maintained for each containment net. This includes the net inventory number, initial date of deployment, the accumulated time in the water, dates of in-water inspections, dates of on-site repairs and maintenance, including detailed reasons for repairs, dates of cleaning, dates and results of out of water complete servicing, stress testing and if applicable the date of retirement of the net pens. These records should follow the net and be available on site.

COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

Maintenance and storage:

The regulation specifies the time period that nets have to undergo regular servicing. In general all nets are to be serviced and strength tested every 18 months, unless the fish are in a longer grow-out period. This service includes net strength testing, assessment of overall condition and any necessary repairs. Any nets deemed inadequate cannot be re-deployed as containment nets and should be disposed of or relegated to other purposes.

In the event a net is damaged after it is deployed, repairs must be made immediately. These repairs are to be noted in the maintenance record and form part of the history of the net. It is permitted to do temporary repairs on a containment net; however, any repairs that are temporary in nature must be replaced with permanent repairs as soon as is practicable.

Ultra violet rays from the sun have harmful effects on containment nets. A net left in the sunlight can deteriorate. Often the weak section of the net is in an isolated location that can be easily over looked during servicing and testing. The regulations require that nets stored on dry land must be in a manner that prevents exposure to UV light.

Photograph 1

Net properly bagged and protected from UV.

While some companies conducted their own net testing and servicing, 87 percent of the companies relied on professional net lofts for their net assessment, maintenance and storage needs. Most companies dealing with specific net lofts would rely upon the net loft for storage of any unused nets. Storage at these facilities is under cover and out of the elements.

COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

The following graph illustrates the compliance rates to the various net maintenance and documentation requirements. It includes compliance to net tagging, on site maintenance, regular servicing requirements, net storage and relevant documentation requirements.

Graph 6



COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

E. Frequency of Net Inspections

Above Water Checks:

The regulation specifies that daily above-water inspections of net cages are required to ensure integrity of the system. These checks may include removal of debris that comes into contact with and damages the containment nets. In addition to the daily checks, storm checks are also required where winds exceed 55 knots. It is a requirement that this information be maintained in the daily maintenance logs.

Of all sites inspected, 100 percent verified that daily checks were being conducted. 93 percent of sites indicated that storm checks were being completed. It was not clear in all cases, however, that this information was being accurately recorded in the logs.

Dive Checks:

Once a containment net is in place, and prior to the introduction of fish, the regulation requires that a dive must be made to check the net for integrity and ensure that no damage to the net occurred during its deployment.

Once fish are introduced, the net must be checked by divers on a regular basis to ensure that the net is properly maintained. There was 100 percent compliance to this requirement for all sites inspected.

The frequency of these dive checks after fish are deployed is dependent upon the use of divers to collect mortalities. The supposition is that divers are able to do hole checks on their weekly mort dives. In this case dive checks on the nets are required on a monthly basis. Where divers are not used to collect mortalities, hole checks are required every two weeks.

It is important that a distinction is made in the log when divers conduct separate hole checks as opposed to a combined mortality and hole check, and to identify them as separate functions. A diver's down time is often the measurement an Inspector will use, in conjunction with other factors such as size of the system and visibility, to determine if suitable time has been spent on system hole checks. It is a requirement that these checks be recorded in the maintenance logs.

In 90 percent of the sites inspected, companies were in compliance with this requirement. In cases where details were incomplete in the daily log and the Inspector could not clearly distinguish between mortality dives and hole checks, companies were cited as being out of compliance.

COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

The following graph illustrates the compliance levels for the type and frequency of net inspections required at the farm site.

Graph 7
Frequency of Net Inspections



Escape Prevention

Factors contributing to escape incidents have been largely attributed to the following six factors:

- system failure;
- boat operations;
- net failure due to the presence of predators;
- net failure due to poor or inadequate maintenance;
- net failure due to known or suspected vandalism activities; or,
- handling errors.

Appendix 5 provides some detailed summary information on marine escapes.

With this in mind, the annual inspection cycle is designed to carefully review on-site operations for activities that may contribute to escape events.

Every operator of a marine site is required to have a written escape prevention and response plan. These plans are site specific and are intended to address site specific concerns. These plans form part of the site's management plan and contain details describing escape prevention, escape response, predator avoidance, description of existing and proposed containment structures, plans for inspection and maintenance of containment structures and monitoring and reporting schedules. All staff must be trained in applicable elements of this plan and a copy of the plan must be available on every site. All sites inspected had escape prevention and response plans.

COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

F. Escape Response

Every operator is required to have a written escape recapture plan. To initiate an effective escape response, it is necessary that staff are well trained in the elements of these plans. These plans must include step-by-step procedures for mitigating against further escapes and for reporting escapes. These plans must be posted in a visible location at the facility and the location and contents of this plan must be well understood by all staff.

In 73 percent of the facilities, plans were appropriately posted, and site staff were able to demonstrate appropriate knowledge of the contents of the plan.

Photograph 2

Escape recovery kit containing dedicated seine net and equipment to be used in the event of an escape.

G. Farm Site Operations

Mortalities:

Fish mortalities are regularly encountered on salmon farms. It is a requirement that these mortalities are collected and disposed of in an appropriate manner. This is important not only from a health perspective but is also a predator avoidance mechanism. Mortalities left in the net cages can attract predators that may in turn damage nets in their attempt to get at the fish. Once collected, mortalities must be inspected for signs of predator attack, and it is required that the results are logged. If there is a repeat pattern of predator attacks the operator of the system is expected to initiate additional measures against predators to avoid net damage and loss of stock.

Mortalities are collected by divers at all farms. Ninety-four percent of farms were in compliance with the required frequency schedule.

COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

The following graph illustrates the compliance rate for the collection, examination and documentation of mortalities.

Graph 8



Net Cage Attachment Points and Jump Nets:

The regulation specifies that the primary point of attachment for net cages is at the water line rope. The water line rope is designed in a manner to support the heavy load of a containment net. Secured to this water line rope are numerous reinforced tie-off points that take the bulk of the strain on the nets once they are deployed. These are the primary attachment points for the containment net and are required to be secured to the walkway with lines that are sound and adequate to withstand the strain of the net. Nets should not be supported by the stanchions or uprights as these are normally not designed to withstand the load and can fail under extreme conditions. The regulation also requires that net stanchions and net cage railing are not used to moor large vessels that could cause damage during strong wind or tidal exchanges.

Jump nets are the portions of net that extend above the water and are designed to prevent fish from jumping over the containment system. The regulation specifies the height of these jump nets must extend at least one meter above the surface of the water.

Inspection results indicate 80 percent of sites are in compliance with respect to net cage attachment points. In some cases on individual containment nets, the tie off points may not all have been secured. The majority of the deficiencies in this area were usually the tie-off points in one corner of the system. Corners are often used by divers for access points to the net cage and occasionally these points may not be re-secured after a dive. Where tie-off issues were noted, these were identified as deficiencies.

COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

There were no situations where large vessels were found to be moored inappropriately.

Jump nets are in place at all farms, with 92 percent meeting the height requirement. Failure to take stretching of new nets into consideration resulted in some non-compliance. New nets must be readjusted during the break-in period.

Net weights and attachment points:

All equipment that comes into contact with containment nets must have a smooth exterior designed to prevent snagging the net on rough edges that might result in tears and loss of fish. This includes both external weights and internal weights that are used as well as any attachment points that might come into contact with the containment nets. It is also important to maintain the equipment as heavy fouling with marine organisms can contribute to snagging or tears. Ninety percent of sites inspected were in compliance with these requirements.

The weighting system must be designed so that net weights are sufficient to prevent excess billowing of the net. A taut net is important, as billowing nets are more subject to becoming snagged as well as more susceptible to tears or damage from predators. Ninety-eight percent of sites were in compliance with this requirement.

The more common deficiencies noted included exposed shackle pins, rough un-trowelled concrete anchors, rock anchors in plastic containers used as internal weights and equipment and heavily fouling of marine organisms on anchoring equipment.

In investigations of incidents where fish have been lost or suspected losses have occurred, it has been found that some tears and subsequent loss of fish can be attributed to improper weighting or through contact with various components of the net weighting or system anchoring points. Industry is continually reviewing these aspects of containment structures and improvements are constant.



PHOTOGRAPH 3 - Typical concrete main anchor, used as external weight.

COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

Boat Docking

To reduce or eliminate potential damage to net cages from vessels travelling to and from farms, a specific docking site for vessels must be identified on the site. The regulation requires this docking site must be designed or located in a manner to prevent propeller damage to the cage systems and must have proper signage. Of the sites inspected, 73 percent had acceptable docking facilities designated and properly marked.



PHOTOGRAPH 4 - Properly designated and signed vessel docking area.

Catch nets

Catch nets are required to be used as a precautionary or secondary containment net when operators are conducting higher risk activities such as transporting, harvesting, grading, sampling and or moving fish. This is to mitigate against possible loss of fish due to human error or equipment failure.

All sites inspected either had equipment on-site or verified that catch nets were used during higher risk activities.

Feed Storage

To reduce the risk of attracting potential predators onto the net cage system it is important that feed is stored in a secure manner and that all walkways and pen systems are kept clear of feed.

COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

All sites stored feed in a secure manner, and 99 percent kept their walkways and systems clear of feed.

PHOTOGRAPH 5 - Properly sealed feed containers.

The following graph indicates compliance to various operational requirements, including net cage attachment point, jump nets, net attachment points, net weight and equipment design, boat docking, catch net and feed storage.

Graph 9



Farm Site Observations

COMPLIANCE RATES – REGULATORY AND LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

Predator Control

Although the regulation does not specify that salmon farms must deploy predator controls there is a requirement that mortalities must be checked for signs of predator attacks. If a pattern of predator attacks is established and mortalities are experienced at a specific location, holders must initiate measures to prevent net damage and loss of fish. Failure to comply with these requirements could be viewed as failure to take reasonable measures to prevent an escape.

Most farm sites inspected had some measure of predator deterrent in place. In some cases, two or more systems were in place. Common types of predator systems include predator nets, shark guards, and bird netting. Other measures reported to be effective deterrents include taut nets either from a weighting system, or in some cases, from the additional weight of antifoulant on the nets, kill permits and electric (otter) fences.

The following graph illustrates the four principal methods used as predator controls at the sites inspected.

Graph 10
Predator Control



PHOTOGRAPH 6 - Bird netting as predator control.

OTHER 2001 COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

A. JOINT INSPECTIONS

In May 2001, MAFF Inspections staff participated in a joint inspection program with MWLAP, FOC, and representatives from the BC Salmon Farmers' Association Code of Practice. The joint inspections were conducted at three salmon farms in the Broughton, Clayoquot and Quadra Island areas. First Nation community representatives also participated in the joint inspections.

The inspections were arranged based on requests from interested parties to view the inspection process and provide input and comments relative to the upcoming 2001 inspection schedule. The joint inspections were considered of value and interest to the majority of participants, and opportunities for further joint training investigations or educational initiatives will continue to be supported and participated in by MAFF compliance staff.

MAFF Inspectors also participated in a number of inspections with MWLAP Conservation Officer staff during the 2001 inspection cycle. Approximately 22 farm site inspections were conducted with Conservation Officer staff, in order to review respective practices and reduce agency presence in the field by streamlining and coordinating inspection efforts.

OTHER 2001 COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

B. PRE-INSPECTIONS FOR NEW APPLICATIONS AND RELOCATIONS

As outlined earlier in the report, a number of salmon farming sites were considered for relocation in 2001 as part of the Salmon aquaculture review.

When the licensing authority approves a new licence application, such as a relocation, a condition of licence prior to any introduction of fish is a satisfactory pre-start up inspection by a MAFF Inspector to ensure compliance with all regulatory and licence requirements. This includes a review of all components identified in the applicant's management plan, compliance with legislative and regulatory requirements and verification the company has met all licence terms and conditions and specific additional conditions.

In 2001, MAFF Inspectors completed four start-up inspections for relocated site applications.

It is anticipated that the recent announcement by government to consider new licence applications for marine salmon farms will follow the same policy guidelines applied for relocated farms relative to those farms selected for relocation. That is, a satisfactory pre-inspection by MAFF Inspection staff will be considered a term and condition of any new Aquaculture Licence.

OTHER 2001 COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

C. DIVE AUDIT PROGRAM

MAFF has recently implemented a random dive audit program for the province's salmon farm aquaculture operations. These dive audits are site specific and unannounced.

Experienced dive teams attend a site with a MAFF Inspection team, spending approximately one day at each selected site, videotaping and examining various farm features below water. Aspects examined include condition of net pens and their repairs, anchoring systems, net weight design and installation, condition of lines and associated hardware and other below-surface features.

The purpose of the unannounced dive audit is to assess under-water farm features and ensure that the operator is in compliance with regulatory requirements and properly managing the underwater maintenance of the containment nets and anchoring systems.

In 2000/2001, a total of 10 dive audits were completed. Of the 10 sites selected, two were located in the Broughton Archipelago, two in Clayoquot Sound, two in Jervis Inlet and four in the Quadra Island, Campbell River area. Photographs from dive audits are included in this section of the report.

Issues identified during these dive audits included:

1) in some cases, external net weights were not properly attached, resulting in billowing of the containment net, increasing the risk of entanglement;

2) in some cases, containment nets were close to the main external weights and could potentially become entangled;

3) some internal net weights had sharp edges that could potentially damage nets through abrasion. In one case, rock bags for internal net weighting were being used;

4) in one containment net, tools and fishing implements that had been accidentally dropped were found entangled;

5) in some cases, chains and other anchoring hardware that had potential to contact the net were fouled with abrasive marine growth;

6) some temporary net repairs had not been replaced with permanent repairs and some net damage had not been addressed as required; and,

OTHER 2001 COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

7) at one site, loose lines were present that provided the potential for entanglement with vessels operating on site.

The farm site operators that were the subject of the dive audits were provided with the results and advised to implement necessary remedial action.

The dive audit program for 2002 has recently commenced. Last year's results will be reviewed and compared when completing the round of dive audits for 2002. Results will be provided in the "2002 Inspection Report on Salmon Farms".

DIVE AUDIT PHOTOGRAPHS

Round cannon ball style weight used as an external weight. More typically found on smaller net cages. One line goes to the surface as a tie off point. The other line is looped through and tied off to the containment net. This line is used to tension tie off points on the net and helps retain the shape of the system.

Smooth cannon ball style weight used internally on net pen systems to help retain the shape of the net cage. The number used varies according to size of the net cage and local conditions.



Plastic 202 litre drum filled with concrete. These are heavier weights used as external weights on the system. One line goes to the surface to support the weight. The other two lines are tied off to the net pens, looped through the chain link and run to the surface. The tension on the nets can be adjusted by tightening these lines. The number or external weights used varies according to the size of the pen and local condition.



Typical net repair either done on site by divers or at the net loft.



Atlantic salmon inside containment system.

OTHER 2001 COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

D. BRANCH INVESTIGATIONS

MAFF Fisheries Inspectors are responsible for conducting in-depth investigations of possible licence violations. For all of these activities, the goal for the Aquaculture Licensing and Compliance Branch is to foster and secure a high state of industry compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements, and where appropriate, pursue necessary enforcement sanctions.

With regard to finfish escapes, the ministry places a high priority on investigating every incident. Protocols are in place to respond to and investigate suspected or known escape incidents and MAFF Inspection staff attempt to attend sites within 72 hours of discovery.

The *Aquaculture Regulation* requires that operators verbally report a suspected or known escape incident within 24 hours of discovery and all operators have been provided with an "Escape Incident Report" (see *Appendix 7*) that outlines information that must be provided in initiating an investigation. As noted earlier in the report, MAFF now has an after-hours toll-free escape reporting line to ensure that appropriate staff are notified immediately of any escape events.

While MAFF's legislative framework does not provide the authority to recapture lost fish, which is a federal DFO responsibility, the company is required to have an escape response plan which identifies efforts to control, mitigate, remedy and confine the escape incident.

Under provincial legislation, MAFF Inspectors have six months from the date of the event to investigate and, if appropriate, pursue enforcement sanctions. Investigations are considered highly confidential until concluded.

Results of investigations may lead to one of the following outcomes:

- determination that the incident (i.e., escape) or possible violation does not warrant any enforcement sanction;
- issuance of a written warning;
- issuance of one or more violation tickets;
- submission of a Report to Crown Counsel with recommended charges; or,
- recommendation to the licensing authority for Aquaculture Licence suspension or revocation.

OTHER 2001 COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

From April 1, 2001 to January 31, 2002, Fisheries Inspectors initiated a total of 68 investigations of possible non-compliance to the (BC) *Fisheries Act* or *Aquaculture Regulation*. Statistics on investigation results follow in more detail.

2001 INVESTIGATIONS

- 35 percent of the cases pertain to alleged finfish violations including escape incidents;
- 21 percent of the cases pertain to alleged shellfish violations;
- 44 percent of the cases pertain to non-aquaculture activities such as commercial fish buying, brokers, spawn-on-kelp harvesting violations.

Current Status of 2001 Investigations:

- 38 cases are still under investigation or considered "open";
- in 14 cases, investigations have been completed, but no further action was deemed necessary;
- in 16 cases, investigations have resulted in the issuance of a violation ticket to the company;
- one investigation resulted in a conviction through the courts. Orca Shipping Inc. was convicted through the courts for failure to take reasonable precautions to prevent an escape while transporting fish. The vessel was on route between a Stolt farm site in Lily Islets to the Englewood processing plant, both located in the Johnston Strait area. Approximately 4,500 pieces of Atlantic salmon were lost when a screened door protecting the intake in the live hold was left open. A fine of $1,000 was levied by the judge; and,
- two Reports to Crown Counsel have been submitted to Crown with recommended charges as a result of fish escape incidents.

SUMMARY

MAFF Inspection staff had for the first time detailed regulatory requirements to assess the current state of compliance and, in general, the overall rate of compliance for 2001 has improved based on a comparison of year 2000 inspection results.

There were two areas where exceptions were identified during the 2001 inspection cycle, namely possessing current and approved site specific management plans and having written net maintenance records on site.

For all identified issues of non-compliance with MAFF's regulatory framework, companies have been provided with a detailed letter outlining inspection findings and necessary remedial action. *Appendix 3* provides an example of the correspondence sent to all farm site operators outlining the results of this year's inspections.

The majority of salmon farm operators are in the process of, or have implemented, necessary actions identified during inspections. Some follow-up inspections have been completed where failure to comply with remedial instructions or within the requested timeframe has been identified. Appropriate enforcement sanctions have been applied for those companies that fail to meet necessary requirements, including the issuance of violation tickets.

A review of the current *Aquaculture Regulation* is currently under way in order to both streamline and enhance requirements, including escape prevention provisions. Government is reviewing the regulation in the context of reaching the following goals:

- maintaining the effectiveness of the escape prevention provisions;
- moving from a prescriptive approach to a more results or performance-based approach;
- encouraging industry to apply innovative methods to prevent escape incidents; and,
- while still ensuring efficient and effective inspections and investigations by government, reduce unnecessary cost burdens for industry.

A summary of the proposed changes can be found on MAFF's salmon aquaculture website, located at http://www.agf.gov.bc.ca/fisheries/salmon_aqua_policy.htm.

Based on the enhancements to MAFF's compliance program and anticipated regulatory changes, it is anticipated that next year's inspection results will find that the level of compliance will continue to improve. MAFF staff will also continue to support efforts by industry to better their management practices, by supporting initiatives such as the industry-driven Code of Practice.

SUMMARY

Opportunities to improve and harmonize compliance and enforcement activities for the salmon farming industry will be ongoing with other agencies such as DFO and MWLAP. Participation in these initiatives should increase efficiencies, reduce duplication of efforts by agencies and demonstrate a strong, integrated and accountable compliance and enforcement regime for the province.

Company List and Number of Farms/Companies Inspected in 2001

- Hardy Sea Farms Inc. 7
- Stolt Sea Farm Inc. 14
- Salt Spring Aquafarms Ltd. 1
- Kitasoo Aquafarms Ltd. 1
- S.K.M. Enterprises Ltd. 1
- Ewos Aquaculture Ltd. 13
- Omega Salmon Group Ltd. 19
- Totem Oysters Ltd. 1
- Saltstream Engineering Ltd. 1
- Connors Bros. Ltd. 7
- Nutreco Canada Inc. 11
- Sonora Sea Farm Ltd. 1
- Creative Salmon Company Ltd. 3
- Grieg Seafood BC Ltd. 3

BRITISH COLUMBIA

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERIES
SALMON FARM SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST - 2001

📖 -to be filled out before inspection -refer to management plan
⚐ -special provisions for enforcement
* -unless otherwise noted references are to the (*Aquaculture Regulation*)

1. OPERATION DESCRIPTION

1.1. Company Name: _____ Location: _____

1.2. Site Name: _____ Aquaculture Licence Number: _____

1.3. Inspection Date and Time: _____

1.4. Person(s) Interviewed: _____

1.5. Inspection Completed by: _____

1.6. General Comments: _____

2. MANAGEMENT PLAN

2.1. 📖 Licensed Species and Production Level

Licensed Species	Licensed Production Level	Licensed Stocking Level

2.2. 📖 Note special provisos on licence file: _____

2.3. Species and Number of Fish on Site

Species	Stocking Level	Average Size	Biomass	Entry Date	Harvest Date

2.4. Net Pen Description (i.e. Steel Frames, Wood, Wood and Steel Combination, Polar Circles)

Type of Net Pen	Size of Net Pen (feet/meters)	Total Number of Each Pen	Total in Use

2.5. Does the approved net pen configuration match actual farm layout? Yes ❑ No ❑

Comments_____

_____

_____

2.6. Appropriate species on site? Yes ❑ No ❑

If no, what species – (note explanation of why on site) _____

_____

_____

2.7. In compliance with special provisos, if any. Yes ❑ No ❑ N/A ❑

2.8. Is the aquaculture license current? **s. 13 of Fisheries Act/ s. 5 of Aquaculture Reg*** Yes ❑ No ❑

3. THERAPEUTANT USE & RECORD KEEPING:

3.1. Are drug administration records kept that include: **s.9(3)**

a) aquaculture licence number and name of holder Yes ❑ No ❑

b) location of aquaculture facility Yes ❑ No ❑

c) species of finfish cultured and held Yes ❑ No ❑

d) name of prescribing veterinarian Yes ❑ No ❑

e) a log naming the drugs, how they were administered, treatment schedule and the name and signature of person responsible for drug administration Yes ❑ No ❑

If no, corrective action noted:_____

_____

_____

3.2. Are treatments currently being administered? **s.9(3)** Yes ❑ No ❑

a) If yes, are the treated groups identified?_____

b) If no indicate date of last treatment: _____

3.3. For current or last treatment, please indicate **s.9(3)**:

a) Name of therapeutant: _____

b) Name of prescribing veterinarian (if applicable) _____

c) Name of feed manufacturer: _____

d) Anticipated withdrawal time: _____

Indicate if and how the medicated feed is distinguished from the non-medicated feed?_____

_____

_____

4. RECORDS AND REPORTS:

4.1. Are the following records being kept? **s. 8.2**

a) Transport, transfer and introduction of fish into or away from the facility — Yes ❑ No ❑

b) Fish sales, including number and destination — Yes ❑ No ❑ N/A ❑

c) Source (hatchery), number and siting of each stock and lot of fish — Yes ❑ No ❑

5. NET MONITORING, EVALUATION AND MAINTENANCE RECORDS

note: references are to Appendix 2 of Aquaculture Regulation

5.1. Is a fish inventory record maintained for each net pen? **s.10(a)-(c)** Yes ❑ No ❑

5.2. How often are visual inspections of active net pens done? **s.12(a)** _____

a) Are they recorded in the maintenance record? Yes ❑ No ❑

5.3. Are all containment structures inspected after a storm with winds over 55 knots? **s.15** Yes ❑ No ❑ N/A ❑

a) Is this recorded in the maintenance record? Yes ❑ No ❑

5.4. Is a written maintenance record kept for all nets? **s.7(d)** Yes ❑ No ❑

a) Is it company policy to keep these records for two years after retirement of the net? Yes ❑ No ❑

5.5. Are repairs made immediately? **s.12(b)** Yes ❑ No ❑

a) Are they recorded in the maintenance record? Yes ❑ No ❑

5.6. Are nets pulled for maintenance every 18 months (accumulated time in water)? **s.13 (i)i-ii** Yes ❑ No ❑

a) If no, why not?_____

_____

b) Is the net strength tested during out of water service? **s.13(i)iii** Yes ❑ No ❑

5.7. Who does the testing? _____

5.8. Are the nets stored in a manner to protect from UV rays vermin and other elements when not in use? **s.13(j)** Yes ❑ No ❑

5.9. Describe net storage:_____

_____

_____

5.10. Are debris that could damage or tear the net removed immediately? **s.20** Yes ❑ No ❑

6. BOAT OPERATIONS

note: references are to Appendix 2 of Aquaculture Regulation

6.1. Is there a written protocol for preventing boat and propeller damage to net pens? **s.8(a)** Yes ❑ No ❑

a) Are staff that operate boats trained in this protocol? **s.8(b)** Yes ❑ No ❑

6.2. Are propeller guards installed on boats that are used regularly around the farm? **s.8(c)** Yes ❑ No ❑

a) if no, why not?_____

_____

_____

6.3. Is there a written protocol on site for towing net pens: **s. 24**

a) within the tenure boundaries? Yes ❑ No ❑

b) outside the tenure boundaries? Yes ❑ No ❑

7. DIVE INSPECTIONS

note: references are to Appendix 2 of Aquaculture Regulation

7.1. Are divers used to collect mortalities at least once a week? **s.11(d)** Yes ❑ No ❑

a) If yes:

Are dive inspections to check for net integrity done monthly? **s.11(c)** Yes ❑ No ❑

b) If no:

Are dive inspections to check for net integrity done bi-weekly? **s.11(e)** Yes ❑ No ❑

8. ANCHORING SYSTEM:

note: references are to Appendix 2 of Aquaculture Regulation

8.1. When was the last subsurface anchor inspection? **s.14(a)(b)** _____

a) Describe inspection method: (divers, camera etc.)_____

_____

9. ESCAPE PREVENTION

note: references are to Appendix 2, Part I

9.1. Is the Escape Prevention and Response Plan on site? **s.1** Yes ❑ No ❑

9.2. What measures does the company employ to detect escapes? (eg: feed records, observations of jumpers outside net, diver observations, underwater cameras, feeding behaviour)_____

_____

_____

9.3. Is there always someone on the site? Yes ❑ No ❑

9.4. If no, how many hours is the site manned per day? (explain)_____

_____

_____

10. ESCAPE RESPONSE

Note: Reference is to Appendix 2, Part III

10.1. Is the escape recapture plan posted in a visible location? **s.32** Yes ❑ No ❑

10.2. Can staff accurately describe the contents of the plan? **s.32** Yes ❑ No ❑

10.3. What type of equipment is on site or available to support the company's escape recovery plan?_____

_____

_____

10.4. Are staff training records maintained - respecting aquaculture, escape prevention and escape response? **s 8.2** Yes ❑ No ❑

11. ESCAPE REPORTS

Note: Reference is to body of Aquaculture Regulation

11.1. During the last 12 months has the farm detected any escapes or possible escapes? Yes ❑ No ❑

If yes:

a) Was the escape reported within 24 hours to the Manager of Aquaculture? **s.8 (1)** Yes ❑ No ❑

b) Was a written report submitted within one week to the Manager of Aquaculture? **s.8 (1.1)** Yes ❑ No ❑

11.2. Are records of all escapes kept? **s.8.2(e)** Yes ❑ No ❑

11.3. Provide details of most recent escape (date/ species/ number/ average weight/ cause/ year stocked/ rearing facility _____

_____

_____

12. PREDATOR AVOIDANCE:

Note: Reference is to Appendix 2, Part IV

12.1. Are predator deterrents used? Yes ❑ No ❑

12.2. If no, give reasons (no record of predators, fish big enough, etc.)_____

_____

_____

12.3. If yes what type of methods are being used to deter predators?

predator nets ❑ shark guards ❑ bird nets ❑ sound devices* ❑

sealed feed ❑ others/comments_____

_____

_____

12.4. Are mortalities inspected for signs of predator attack? **s.40** Yes ❑ No ❑

12.5. Are mortalities resulting from predator attacks recorded in the written inventory record? **s.41** Yes ❑ No ❑

12.6. What measures are taken when a pattern of predator attacks is established? **s.42**

_____

_____

13. HARVESTING AND PROCESSING

13.1. Harvest method used: Towed ❑ Live Haul ❑ Stunned and Bled ❑

13.2. Where are the fish processed? _____

14. FARM SITE OBSERVATIONS

Note: Reference is to Appendix 2

Net pen requirements

14.1. Is the primary point of attachment at the water line rope? **s.7(f)** Yes ❑ No ❑

14.2. Does the jump net extend at least 1 meter above the water line? **s.7(g)** Yes ❑ No ❑

14.3. Is sufficient weight or pressure used to produce tension on net panels with the aim of maintaining a taut net? **s.7(h)** Yes ❑ No ❑

14.4. Is the net size appropriate for the size of fish contained? **s.7(i)** Yes ❑ No ❑

14.5. Does all equipment that could come into contact with the net pen have a smooth exterior? **s.7(j)** Yes ❑ No ❑

14.6. Note flotation and condition of floats used for the net cage system: **s.7(j)**_____

_____

_____

14.7. Do all net pens have permanent tags that meet the requirements of **s.7(a)-(c)**? Yes ❑ No ❑

Operational Activities

14.8. Has a docking site been designated for visiting boats? **s.8(d)** Yes ❑ No ❑

a) Is it clearly marked? **s.8(e)** Yes ❑ No ❑

b) Is it designed to prevent propeller damage to net pens? **s. 8(f)** Yes ❑ No ❑

14.9. Is feed stored in a secure manner? **s.43** Yes ❑ No ❑

14.10. Are walkways and pen systems kept clear of feed? **s.44** Yes ❑ No ❑

14.11. Are spotters used during:

a) Fish handling activities?**s.18** Yes ❑ No ❑ N/A ❑

b) When a large vessel is operating nearby? **s.18** Yes ❑ No ❑ N/A ❑

14.12. Are stanchions or net cage railings used to moor large vessels? **s.19** Yes ❑ No ❑ N/A ❑

14.13. Are there catch nets on site? Yes ❑ No ❑ N/A ❑

a) Are they used when transporting, harvesting, grading, sampling, and moving live fish outside net pens? **s.22** Yes ❑ No ❑ N/A ❑

15. BIOSECURITY PROCEDURES

Note: collected for information purposes only

15.1. Are Footbaths stations being used? Yes ❑ No ❑

a) Location of footbaths: _____

b) What type of liquid is used_____

c) How often is the liquid replaced? _____

d) How is the liquid disposed of?_____

15.2. Indicate other measures the company uses to prevent spread of disease (company's policy on sharing of equipment, use of workers between sites) : _____

_____

_____

15.3. Are there multiple year classes on site? Yes ❑ No ❑

15.4. If yes, are year classes separated on site? Yes ❑ No ❑

NOTES

BRITISH COLUMBIA

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERIES SALMON FARM SITE INSPECTION COMPLIANCE REPORT

Report Section	Compliant	Report Section	Compliant
1. Operation Description	Yes ❑ No ❑	9. Escape Prevention	Yes ❑ No ❑
2. Management Plan	Yes ❑ No ❑	10. Escape Response	Yes ❑ No ❑
3. Therapeutant Use and Record Keeping	Yes ❑ No ❑	11. Escape Reports	Yes ❑ No ❑
4. Reports and Records	Yes ❑ No ❑	12. Predator Avoidance	Yes ❑ No ❑
5. Net Monitoring, Evaluation and Maintenance	Yes ❑ No ❑	13. Harvesting and Processing	Yes ❑ No ❑
6. Boat Operations	Yes ❑ No ❑	14. Farm Site Observations	Yes ❑ No ❑
7. Dive Inspections	Yes ❑ No ❑	15. Biosecurity Procedures	Yes ❑ No ❑
8. Anchoring System	Yes ❑ No ❑		

**If not in compliance see below for further details

Company name _____

Site name/Reference #: _____

Person interviewed _____

Signature _____

MAFF Inspector _____

Date and Time of Inspection

_____

Issue	Sections of Aquaculture Regulation/Fisheries Act contravened, if applicable.	Required/Recommended corrective measures	Compliance Date/Follow-up Date	Written notice of compliance necessary (y / n)	Comments

General comments on overall condition and operations of site: _____

_____

_____

_____

NOTE: ADDITIONS AND/OR CHANGES TO THIS INSPECTION DOCUMENT MAY BE MADE BEFORE IT IS FORWARDED TO THE LICENCE HOLDER'S MAIN OFFICE.

Signature of Inspector: _____

Date Forwarded to Head Office: _____

Date of Chief Inspector Review: _____

BRITISH COLUMBIA

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERIES SALMON FARM SITE INSPECTION COMPLIANCE REPORT

Page _____ of _____

**If not in compliance see below for further details

Reference # _____

Signature _____

Issue	Sections of Aquaculture Regulation/Fisheries Act contravened, if applicable.	Required/Recommended corrective measures	Compliance Date/Follow-up Date	Written notice of compliance necessary (y / n)	Comments

NOTE: ADDITIONS AND/OR CHANGES TO THIS INSPECTION DOCUMENT MAY BE MADE BEFORE IT IS FORWARDED TO THE LICENCE HOLDER'S MAIN OFFICE.

Signature of Inspector: _____

Date Forwarded to Head Office: _____

Date of Chief Inspector Review: _____

BRITISH COLUMBIA

(Date)

MAFF Ref: (xxxx)
Landfile: (xxxxxxx)

(Company Contact Name)
(Company Name)
(Address)

Dear (Company Name):

The purpose of this letter is to provide the results of the 2001 salmon farm inspection conducted by BC Fisheries at your (Site Name)site, (MAFF reference: xxxx). The inspection was conducted on (Date) by (Inspector Name) , BC Fisheries Inspector and the farm site employee interviewed during the course of this inspection was (Employee Name). Please note (Employee Name) was provided with a copy of the Summary Compliance Report, along with a copy of the recently amended *Aquaculture Regulation* for his use and reference.

Enclosed is the Head Office's copy of the Summary Compliance Report identifying primary review areas by section. Please note, however, that there were areas identified as non-compliant relative to the *Fisheries Act (BC)* or the *Aquaculture Regulation*, as summarized below.

- **Section 9 Subsection (3), Aquaculture Regulation:**

"Record of drugs
(3) The record referred to in subsection (1) shall include the following information:
(a) the aquaculture licence number and name of the holder;
(b) the location of the aquaculture facility;
(c) the species of fin fish cultured and held;
(d) the name of the veterinarian who prescribed any drugs;
(e) a log naming the drugs, how they were administered, the treatment schedule including the date treatment commenced, the date of the last treatment and the name and signature of the person responsible for administering each treatment."

Remedial Action Required:

Effective immediately, you are required to maintain accurate drug records as set out in the regulation above and ensure that records are readily available for review during inspections

Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries
Aquaculture Licensing and Compliance Branch
Mailing Address:
2500 Cliffe Avenue
Courtenay BC V9N 5M6
Phone: (250) 897-7540
Fax: (250) 334-1410
Location:
2500 Cliffe Avenue, Courtenay

- **Section 7 (d), Appendix 2, Aquaculture Regulation:**

"The requirements for net pens are as follows:
(d) holders must have a written maintenance record for each net pen that includes
(i) the inventory control number,
(ii) the date of initial deployment if deployed after October 31, 2000,
(iii) the accumulated time in water after October 31, 2000,
(iv) dates of in-water inspections,
(v) dates of on-site repairs and maintenance, including detailed reasons for repair,
(vi) dates of any cleaning,
(vii) dates of results of out-of-water complete servicing and stress testing, and
(viii) if applicable, the date of retirement of the net pen;"

Remedial Action Required:

Immediately, appropriate measures must be taken to develop and maintain complete net records as set out in the regulation noted above and ensure that they are readily available for review during inspections.

- **Section 8 (d), (e), Appendix 2, Aquaculture Regulation:**

"The requirements for boat operations are as follows:
(d) the holder must designate a docking site for boats not involved in the cultivation of fish;
(e) the holder must ensure that signs are on the containment system to direct boats not involved in the cultivation of fish to designated docking sites;"

Remedial Action Required:

You are immediately to identify and ensure the implementation of appropriate docking site design and signage with reference to the above noted Sections (d), and (e) above.

- **Section 22, Appendix 2, Aquaculture Regulation:**

"Catch nets must be used to prevent escapes due to human error, equipment failure, or fish jumping out of the equipment while holders are transporting, harvesting, grading, sampling and moving live fin fish outside of net pens."

Remedial Action Required:

Immediately you are to begin using catch nets with regard to the above noted section.

- **Section 32, Appendix 2, Aquaculture Regulation:**

"Holders must ensure that their escape recapture plans are posted in visible locations at their Facilities and that the locations and contents of the posted plans are made known to all staff."

Remedial Action Required:

Immediately obtain copies of escape recapture plans and post in visible locations on site.

- **Section 16 (d), Fisheries Act**

  Form of Licences
  "A licence under this Part must set out the following:
  (d) other terms and conditions the minister considers appropriate."

Remedial Action Required:

Per the requirement for an approved Management Plan under Section 16 (d) above, the currently approved Management Plan on file is not consistent with your facility's operation. Net pen configuration on this site does not agree with the configuration in the current Management Plan. You are required to submit an amended Management Plan to this office within 60 days for review.

The intent of providing you with this information is to work with your company to achieve compliance, rather than having to consider any further enforcement options. You should be aware however, that failure to remedy the above-noted contravention could result in the issuance of a violation ticket or more serious sanctions.

If you have any questions concerning the content of this letter or the enclosed Summary Compliance Report, please do not hesitate to contact (Name of Licensing Clerk) in our Courtenay office at 250-XXX-XXXX or myself at 250-XXX-XXXX.

BC Fisheries is committed to working with industry representatives to ensure that the health, environmental, economic and social objectives of the aquaculture industry are being met and you are encouraged to contact us if you require guidance on any of the issues discussed in this letter. Thank you in advance for your attention to the results of this inspection.

Yours truly,

(Inspector Name)
BC Fisheries Inspector
Licensing and Enforcement Section

Enclosure (1): Compliance Report Summary, Head Office Copy

pc: Jackie Hunter, Manager, Aquaculture Licensing and Compliance Branch
Charlie Twaddle, Chief Inspector, Aquaculture Licensing and Compliance Branch

Legislation:

Fisheries Act:

- http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca/statreg/stat/F/96149_01.htm

Aquaculture Regulation (amended October 31, 2000)

- http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca/statreg/reg/F/Fisheries/364_89.htm

SUMMARY OF MARINE ESCAPE REPORTS:

- The factors contributing to escapes can be roughly divided into six general categories:

1. **System Failure:** failure of containment structures or anchoring systems that result from a technological failure not related to nets, generally of a catastrophic nature. Can most often be attributed to extreme weather or ecological events (i.e. floods). This cause of escape has declined dramatically over the last decade and no major escapes (over 10,000 fish) have resulted from system failure in the last seven years.
2. **Boat Operations:** net tears or infrastructure damage resulting from propeller or whole boat collisions with the net pen system.
3. **Net Failure (predators):** net tears resulting from seal, sea lion or dogfish attacks.
4. **Net Failure (maintenance)**: net tears resulting from poor or inadequate maintenance such as chafing of nets due to contact with abrasive equipment, failure to repair small holes, deterioration of nets with age, failure to remove dead fish or debris, etc.
5. **Net Failure (known or suspected vandalism)**: fish loss resulting from a suspected or known vandalism incident.
6. **Handling:** fish loss that results during fish handling events such as fish transfer, net changes, towing, sorting, grading, harvesting, etc and is not related to failure of the integrity of a net-pen or containment structure. This type of escape can generally be directly attributed to human error.

Table 1: Summary of Causes of Reported Marine Escapes Between 1989 and 2000.

Cause	1989-1992			1993-1996			1997-2000		
	% incident	# incident	% pieces	% incident	# incident	% pieces	% incident	# incident	% pieces
1. System Failure	54.3%	19	70.7%	13.0%	3	20.2%	3.8%	1	3.3%
2. Boat Operations	8.6%	3	2.8%	17.4%	4	10.1%	15.4%	4	15.4%
3. Net Failure (predators)	11.4%	4	1.6%	21.7%	5	25.7%	26.9%	7	8.2%
4. Net Failure (maintenance)	5.7%	2	2.8%	21.7%	5	31.9%	3.8%	1	13.2%
5. Net Failure (known or suspected vandalism)	8.6%	3	19.2%	0.0%	0	0.0%	7.7%	2	32.2%
6. Handling	11.4%	4	2.9%	21.7%	5	7.0%	42.3%	11	27.7%
7. Unknown	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	1	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total incidents		**35**			**23**			**26**	
Average Pieces			**215123**			**39561**			**60424**

Data compiled from Atlantic Salmon Watch program and escape reports submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries
% incident: percentage of escape incidents over a four year interval
# incident: total number of escape incidents over a four year interval
% pieces: percentage of the total number of fish lost over a four year interval

Figure 1: Causes of Marine Farmed Salmon Escapes by Percentage of Reported Fish Lost.



Data compiled from Atlantic Salmon Watch program and escape reports submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

Figure 2. Causes of Marine Farmed Salmon Escapes by Percentage of Reported Incidents.



Data compiled from Atlantic Salmon Watch program and escape reports submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

Figure 3. Marine Farmed Salmon Losses in British Columbia 1989-2000



Data compiled from Atlantic Salmon Watch program and escape reports submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

Figure 4. Marine Farmed Salmon Escapes as a Percentage of Production.



Data compiled from Atlantic Salmon Watch program and escape reports submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FISHERIES – BC FISHERIES

MARINE FINFISH AQUACULTURE LICENSING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR APPLICATIONS

Note: This document is subject to regular review and revision.

1. Purpose

The purpose of the policy is to provide guidance to licensing authorities on the consideration of licenses for the purposes of marine finfish aquaculture.

This policy is intended to assist in the exercise of discretion of the licensing authority and does not purport to alter any provisions of the *British Columbia Fisheries Act, the British Columbia Aquaculture Regulation*, or other relevant legislation.

2. Legislative and Regulatory Authority

British Columbia Fisheries Act
British Columbia Aquaculture Regulation

3. Decision-Makers

Minister of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries: Fisheries Act
Manager, Aquaculture Licensing and Compliance: Delegated Authority
Senior Licensing Officer: Delegated Authority

4. General Principles Governing the Exercise of Authority to Issue a Salmon Aquaculture License

- Fairness
- Transparency
- Efficiency
- Accountability

5. Application for Salmon Aquaculture License

5.1. Application form and information required

The applicant must complete a Commercial Finfish Aquaculture Management Plan ("Plan"). The Plan is the application form for an aquaculture license and also, where required, a Crown land tenure.

The Plan is submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (MAFF).

MAFF may request further information that assists in the review and adjudication of the application.

5.2. Questions and Assistance

Aquaculture Development Branch will work with the applicant to provide any required assistance in completing the Plan.

6. Referrals

The Plan may be referred to other government departments and agencies for review and comment. These agencies may include the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, the Ministry of Water, Land and Air Protection, the BC Assets and Lands Corporation, local governments, and other agencies and organizations as appropriate.

Where the application has a potential to impact a First Nation's rights or interests, First Nations will be consulted in accordance with the applicable First Nations consultation protocols.

7. Public notice and consultation

Reasonable efforts will be made to notify affected parties and provide them with an opportunity to comment on the application.

MAFF may require the applicant to provide public notice of the proposed application in a manner that is acceptable.

8. Applicant's Response

The applicant will be provided with an opportunity to respond to any relevant material or information provided through the referral and public consultation process.

9. Decision

The Minister or delegated licensing authorities may, upon receipt of an application for a salmon aquaculture license:

- issue a salmon aquaculture license on terms and conditions that the Minister or licensing authority deems reasonable in the circumstances;
- deny the application; or
- decline to make a decision and refer the Plan back to the applicant for further information.

The applicant will be notified of the decision in writing, with reasons as appropriate.

10. Issuance of a Salmon Aquaculture License if in the Public Interest

Given that a salmon aquaculture license confers a right to carry on the business of commercial aquaculture using a valuable public resource, a license should only be issued if it is in the public interest to do so.

In deciding whether it is in the public interest to issue a salmon aquaculture license, the licensing authority should consider the following paramount principles:

- Protection of public health and safety;
- Protection of the environment;
- Sustainable economic development.

11. Assessment of an Application for a Salmon Aquaculture License

In assessing an application, the licensing authority may consider any of the following:

11.1. Requirements of the *Fisheries Act and Aquaculture Regulation*

The licensing authority may consider whether the applicant has met all the requirements of the *Fisheries Act and Aquaculture Regulation*.

11.2. Completion of Forms

The Plan and any supporting documentation should be complete prior to the application being considered by the licensing authority.

11.3. Suitability of Site/Facilities for Proposed Aquaculture Operation

Based on the recommendations of Aquaculture Development Branch staff, the licensing authority should consider whether the proposed site has the biophysical capacity to support the proposed operation.

11.4. Past or Demonstrable Performance of Applicant

This may include a review of the following:

- Whether the operator has any previous convictions under the provincial *Fisheries Act, Aquaculture Regulation* or other relevant legislation;
- Whether the operator has been the subject of any aquaculture license suspensions, cancellations or refusals to issue licenses in accordance with Sections 18 or 19 of the *Fisheries Act*;
- Whether there are any outstanding Fisheries Act fees or royalties owed to the Crown in relation to any other aquaculture or commercial seafood licenses currently or previously held by the applicant;
- The financial capacity and stability of the applicant to support the proposed operation, including liability insurance;
- That the applicant has appropriate and sufficient experience/qualifications in aquaculture operations.

11.5. Comments from Referrals

The licensing authority should consider the comments of all parties consulted in the referral process (refer to section 6, above).

11.6. Public Input/Comments

The licensing authority may consider the impact of the proposed operation on other uses, users and resources within the area of operation.

The licensing authority may consider the adequacy of public notice and public input.

The licensing authority may consider the nature and extent of local community support for the proposed operation.

11.7. Economic and Employment Benefits

The licensing authority may consider the significance of the contribution of the operation to the local and provincial economy. This may include an identification and review of the impact on secondary businesses and industries.

The licensing authority may consider whether the proposed operation will involve technological innovations or enhancements that may lead to improvements in the standards of operation for the salmon aquaculture industry.

11.8. Escape Prevention, Detection and Response

The licensing authority may consider the adequacy of the applicant's measures and plans regarding the prevention, detection and response to escapes of finfish.

11.9. Consultations with other individuals and agencies

The licensing authority may consult with other individuals or bodies as deemed appropriate. They may include:

- The Fisheries Aquaculture Biologist, Aquaculture Development Branch, or equivalent;
- The Fish Farm Review Committee, or equivalent;
- The Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries Fish Health Veterinarian.

11.10. Other Relevant Factors

The licensing authority may also consider any other factors relevant to the specific circumstances of each case.

12. Terms and Conditions of License

The licensing authority may issue a license on terms and conditions deemed appropriate in the circumstances.

13. Reporting and Monitoring

British Columbia Fisheries Inspectors will ensure compliance with the *Fisheries Act*, *Aquaculture Regulation*, and terms and conditions of the aquaculture license through reporting and the conducting of regular inspections and other monitoring activities as appropriate, including spot audits.

Any noted activities of non-compliance will be reported to the Senior Licensing Officer.

Note: A pre-operation inspection by a BC Fisheries Inspector will be required for any new operation.

14. Renewal of Existing Licenses

In considering renewal of an existing license, the licensing authority may apply any or all of the policy as appropriate in the circumstances.

15. Suspension and Revocation

Licenses may be suspended or revoked in accordance with section 18 of the *Fisheries Act*.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries

Fisheries and Aquaculture Division
Licensing and Enforcement Section

ESCAPE INCIDENT REPORT

Verbal Reporting Requirements, pursuant to Section 8(1)(a) of the *Aquaculture Regulation*:

> "The holder, or a person acting on behalf of a holder, who discovers an escape or evidence suggesting an escape of aquatic plants or fish from an attachment or containment structure in the holder's aquaculture facility shall report the escape or evidence to the manager (a) verbally, within 24 hours of the discovery,..."

- **To verbally report suspected fin fish farm escapes within 24 hours of discovery during government working hours contact Jaclynn Hunter, Manager of Aquaculture, at 250-897-7540, or Charlie Twaddle, Deputy Manager of Aquaculture, at 250-387-9567.**

- **To verbally report suspected fin fish escapes within 24 hours of discovery during non-government working hours, including weekends and statutory holidays, contact our toll-free number 1-877-223-4673.**

****

Written Reporting Requirements for suspected or known escapes of fin fish pursuant to Section 8(1.1) of the *Aquaculture Regulation:*

> "...an escape, or evidence suggesting an escape, of fin fish, described in subsection (1) must be reported in writing to the manager within one week of the discovery."

Written Report To: **Jaclynn Hunter**
Manager of Aquaculture
Tel: 250-897-7540
Fax: 250-334-1410

Date of Report:_____ # of Supplemental Pages: _____ MAFF Licence #: _____

Farm Site Name: _____

Farm Contact Number: _____

Farm Site Location: _____

Date of Escape or Suspected Escape: _____ Estimated Time of Incident: _____

Species of Fin Fish: _____ Estimated Number: _____

Average weight of the fin fish that escaped or may have escaped: _____

Were the fish in question being treated and/or has the withdrawal clearance time not yet elapsed?

If yes, therapeutant prescribed: _____ Withdrawal dates: _____

Calendar year in which the fin fish were stocked at the aquaculture facility: _____

Rearing facility from which the fin fish were received by the aquaculture facility: _____

Cause or Suspected Cause of the Incident:

_____

_____

Cause or Suspected Cause of the Incident - continued:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Measures taken to control, mitigate, remedy and confine effects of escape:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Escape Response and Recapture Attempts:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Atlantic Salmon Watch/FOC advised of suspected or known escape: _____

_____

Additional Comments:

_____

_____

_____

Submitted by: _____ _____ _____

Signature **Printed Name** **Title and Company**